

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/690,368

Applicant(s)

JONES ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew J. Ludwig

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 August 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-10,13-18 and 21-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-10,13-18 and 21-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed 8/21/02.
2. Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13-18, and 21-24, are pending in the case. Claims 1, 9, and 17, are independent claims. Claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 19, and 20, were cancelled in accordance with the Preliminary Amendment filed 8/21/02.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mueller, USPN 6,694,484 filed (6/3/97).**

**In reference to independent claim 1, Mueller teaches:**

The HTML documents utilized within the tag detection methods of Mueller would have provided a reasonable suggestion of a mass-produced printed-paper. The claim limitation, "mass-produced printed paper", does not preclude the Examiner from using a generic HTML document as it allows for any form of media to contained within and printed on demand. See column 6, lines 58-67.

If an association tag is found, then the association module reads the index reference. See column 6, lines 65-67. The detection methods taught by Mueller provide a proficient means for detecting a reference at a first location within the HTML document that is association with a second location. The terms 'detecting a *reference* at a *first location*', (as presently claimed) does

not provide the Examiner with a specific description of the detection methods. Furthermore, the terms do not preclude the Examiner from using the teachings of Mueller to provide a reasonable suggestion of a reference and two separate locations.

The detection methods taught by Mueller provide a link between an application program, a reference tag, and the index reference. Mueller suggest the direct association between the processes and the means for retrieving information pertinent to a document and displaying the information. See column 8, lines 36-67.

The reference does not explicitly disclose the formation of a *link*; however, the detection methods taught by Mueller disclose a means for detecting an association tag and associating the tag reference with an index reference. The claim language, '*link within the version between the first location and the second location*' does not preclude the Examiner from utilizing the associations between the tag and an index reference to suggest a link between two distinct locations. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Mueller before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the associations between the application program, the detected tags, the index reference, and included a link to provide a similar function for allowing the application program, thereby improving the performance in accessing the stored information.

Mueller discloses the association module may be invoked automatically when the application program is invoked, or alternatively, may be invoked in response to a selection made by the user via the input device (compare to "an indicator for highlighting the link within the displayed version"). See column 5, lines 61-67. The reference provides a description of an input device, which invokes an application program. An indicator, as presently claimed, does not

preclude the Examiner from utilizing the input device taught by Mueller to provide a similar feature of highlighting the link within a version to initiate the application program.

**In reference to dependent claim 2**, Mueller teaches:

Typically, the user initiates a spell check operation on a document, such as an HTML document in the case of the present invention (compare to, “displaying a first selector associated with a first portion of the paper”). See column 8, lines 8-32. The users initiating a spell check program through an input device provides a suggestion of an indicator for initiating of an application program. A second selector associated with a second portion of the paper would be the suggested replacements of properly spelled words that do not meet the criteria and are presented to the user. The method discloses a method for providing suggestions to the user based on a second selector associated with a second portion of the document.

The third limitation presented, “displaying a likeness of the first portion”, does not provide the Examiner with a proficient description of the Applicant’s invention. Therefore, the spell checker example provides a reasonable suggestion of distinct selectors, one for initiating the spell check program, and a second selector including replacement words.

**In reference to claims 9 and 10**, the claims reflect the system comprising instructions for performing the detection and linking methods as claimed in claims 1 and 2 respectively, and in further view of the following, are rejected along the same rationale.

**In reference to claims 17 and 18**, the claims reflect the system comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claims 1, 2, 4, and 5, respectively, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2178

**5. Claims 5-8, 13-16, and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mueller as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gill et al., USPN 6,081,262 filed (12/4/96).**

**In reference to dependent claim 5-8, Mueller teaches:**

A spell checker program that scans through the HTML document confirming that each word constitutes a properly spelled word. Those that do not meet these criteria are identified and the user is typically prompted with several suggested replacements. See column 8, lines 10-20. However, the reference does not explicitly teach a pan function on the displayed likeness. Gill discloses a zoom box included in the title bar to enable the user to click on this icon and either enlarge this document page to full screen size or reduce the document page to its previous size. The right hand side of the document page is delimited by a scroll bar which includes upward pointing and downward pointing and downward pointing scroll direction arrows, as well as a scroll box, which the user moves in a vertical direction to browse through the document. The methods taught by Gill provide a means for document layout system for a multi media presentation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Mueller and Gill before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the document methods taught by Mueller to include the display presentation techniques of Gill, because it would have provided an enhanced document layout features for multimedia presentations.

**In reference to claims 13-16, the claims reflect the system comprising instructions for performing the detection and linking methods as claimed in claims 1, 2, 4, and 5, respectively, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.**

Art Unit: 2178

**In reference to claims 21-24**, the claims reflect the system comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claims 1, 2, 4, and 5, respectively, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ferrel et al.,

USPN 6,584,480

filed (10/30/00)

In reference to dependent claims 26-30, the claims reflect the system comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claims 16-20, respectively, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 703-305-8043. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ML  
June 16, 2004



**STEPHEN S. HONG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**